

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

<hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/> SENTINEL INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD.,	: : : : :	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
CONRAD J. BENEDETTO, individually and doing business as THE LAW OFFICES OF CONRAD J. BENEDETTO, and JOHN GROFF,	: : : : : : :	Civil No. 19-20142 (RMB/AMD)
Defendants.	:	
<hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>		
CONRAD J. BENEDETTO, THE LAW OFFICES OF CONRAD J. BENEDETTO, and JOHN GROFF,	: : : : : : :	
Plaintiffs,	:	
v.	:	
SENTINEL INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD., et al.,	: : : : :	

**CONRAD J. BENEDETTO AND THE LAW OFFICES OF CONRAD J. BENEDETTO’S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY TO SENTINEL INSURANCE COMPANY’S
RESPONSE TO THEIR MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Conrad J. Benedetto and the Law Offices of Conrad J. Benedetto respectfully request leave of this Court to file a Reply to the Response filed by Sentimental Insurance Company’s Response to their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. A copy of the proposed Reply is attached hereto as Exhibit “A”.

1) Sentinel Insurance Company filed a response to the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment filed by the moving parties which argues that the motion should be denied based on assertion that it is procedurally defective because of they “have not submitted any affidavits or documents in support of their motion or citations to any record evidence purportedly supporting the assertions contained therein”.

2) The moving parties seek leave of court to file a Reply to said argument.

3) District courts have granted motions to file additional memoranda in the interest of completeness or for unusual circumstances. Christion v. Pressler & Pressler, LLP, No. 07-1938, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23751, 2010 WL 988547, at *2 n.3 (D.N.J. Mar. 12, 2010); United States v. Lane Labs-USA, 324 F. Supp. 2d 547, 563 (D.N.J. 2004); Arcand v. Brother Int'l Corp., 673 F. Supp. 2d 282, 290 (D.N.J. 2000).

4) Many District Courts “routinely” grant leave “when a party is ‘unable to contest matters presented to the court for the first time in the last scheduled pleading.’” Ben-Kotel v. Howard Univ., 319 F.3d 532, 536 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (quoting Lewis v. Rumsfeld, 154 F. Supp. 2d 56, 61 (D.D.C. 2001); see also Fun Servs. of Kansas City, Inc. v. Love, 2011 WL 1843253, at *3 (W.D.Mo. May 11, 2011).

5) Without the opportunity to file a Reply, the moving parties cannot respond to the Sentinel Insurance Company’s argument.

For all the foregoing reasons, Conrad J. Benedetto and the Law Offices of Conrad J. Benedetto respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant them leave to file a Reply to Sentinel Insurance Company’s Response to the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment filed by Conrad J. Benedetto and the Law Offices of Conrad J. Benedetto

Respectfully submitted,

THE LAW OFFICES OF CONRAD J. BENEDETTO

BY: S/CONRAD J. BENEDETTO, ESQUIRE

Conrad J. Benedetto, Esquire

1615 South Broad Street

Philadelphia, PA 19240

Telephone number: 215-389-1900

Email: benedettolegalassociates@gmail.com

Pro Se and attorney for the

Law Offices of Conrad J. Benedetto

Date: August 27, 2020